REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Amendments were made to the specification to correct a typographical error and to clarify the specification. No new matter has been added by any of the amendments to the specification. Claims 1-7 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-7 are amended to conform to current U.S. practices and to correct grammatical errors. Support for the amendment to claims 1 and 3 can be found in the specification on page 8, lines 12-19. Support for the amendment to claim 7 can be found in the originally filed claims. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner rejects claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner states the following in regards to the claims:

> Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
>
> The claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors. For example, claim 1 recites "Portal-Sever system comprising: component..." and claim 3 recites "Method...". Examiner suggests amending the claim language to recite "A Portal-Sever system comprising a component", and "A method", etc. It is noted that the described language above however is not an exhaustive list of errors.
>
> Claim 1 recites the limitation "the local Portal page". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Applicants have amended the claims accordingly. Therefore, the rejection of claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph has been overcome.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 102, Anticipation

The Examiner rejects claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by *Hamada et al.*, Method and Apparatus for Editing Web Document From Plurality of Web Site Information, U.S. Publication 2002/0078105, June 20, 2002 (hereinafter "*Hamada*"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In regards to claim 1, the Examiner asserts the following:

> Regarding claim 1, Hamada disclosed a method and system comprising component to add references in an existing navigation tree of the local Portal page (see paragraph [0028]) representing a placeholder for a navigation tree of a Portal fragment of a remote Portal ("insertion positions", see paragraph [0031], [0264], [0286]; "partial documents", see paragraph [0031], [0058], [0067], [0068], [0286]); component to establish communication with [[said]] the remote Portal and to receive Meta-information of [[said]] the Portal fragment via a

> Communication component of [[said]] the remote Portal, wherein [[said]] the Meta-information completes describes the navigation tree of [[said]] the Portal fragment (see paragraph [0073]); component to merge [[said]] the existing navigation tree of [[said]] the local Portal with [[said]] the navigation tree of [[said]] the Portal fragment resulting in a new navigation tree, and to traverse [[said]] the new navigation tree by applying the look and feel of [[said]] the local Portal (see paragraph [0067][,0267][,0268]).

Office Action dated June 1, 2007, page 3.

A prior art reference anticipates the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102 only if every element of a claimed invention is identically shown in that single reference, arranged as they are in the claims. In re Bond, 910 F.2d 831, 832, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566, 1567 (Fed. Cir. 1990). All limitations of the claimed invention must be considered when determining patentability. *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1582, 32 U.S.P.Q.2d 1031, 1034 (Fed. Cir. 1994). Anticipation focuses on whether a claim reads on the product or process a prior art reference discloses, not on what the reference broadly teaches. *Kalman v. Kimberly-Clark Corp.*, 713 F.2d 760, 218 U.S.P.Q. 781 (Fed. Cir. 1983). In this case each and every feature of the presently claimed invention is not identically shown in the cited reference, arranged as they are in the claims. Amended claim 1 is as follows:

> 1. A portal-server system comprising:
>
> a component to add a reference to an existing navigation tree of a local portal, wherein the reference represents a placeholder for a navigation tree of a portal fragment of a remote portal and wherein the navigation tree defines a relationship between nodes of the navigation tree;
>
> a component to establish communication with the remote portal and to receive meta-information of the portal fragment via a communication component of the remote portal, wherein the meta-information describes the navigation tree of the portal fragment;
>
> a component to merge the existing navigation tree of the local portal with the navigation tree of the portal fragment resulting in a new navigation tree; and
>
> a component to traverse the new navigation tree by applying a look and feel of the local portal.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to clarify the meaning of the terms "navigation tree" as recited in the claims. *Hamada* fails to teach any of the features of the presently claimed invention. For example, *Hamada* does not teach the feature "a component to add a reference to an existing navigation tree of a local portal, wherein the reference represents a placeholder **for a navigation tree** of a portal fragment of a remote portal and wherein the navigation tree **defines a relationship between nodes** of the navigation tree" as recited in amended claim 1.

The Examiner appears to assert otherwise, citing numerous sections of *Hamada* as teaching "insertion points" and "partial documents." The sections of *Hamada* cited by the Examiner are as follows:

> [0031] According to one aspect of the present invention there is provided a document editing method for editing parts of contents of one or a plurality of first documents described by any markup language on a World Wide Web (WWW) in

Internet into a second document described by a specific markup language on the WWW, comprising: extracting one or a plurality partial documents from the first documents according to locations of the first documents on the Internet and ranges of the partial documents to be extracted described by the specific markup language in the second document; and inserting the partial documents extracted by the extracting step into the second document according to insertion positions of the partial documents on the second document described by the specific markup language in the second document.

[0058] The functions required for composing a plurality of web documents into a single web document can be narrowed down to three types including extraction, insertion and conversion. However, in general, not necessarily the entire web document (HTML document, for example) but only a part of it will be required as the web site information, i.e., contents, so that the extraction function is required to extract a partial document from arbitrary web document. Also, the insertion function is required to be flexible such that a table can be inserted into a table at a time of composition by combining a plurality of extracted partial documents. In addition, there can be cases where it is insufficient to have just these functions and a document conversion function is required in order to adjust the extracted partial documents into the same format when they have non-uniform formats at a time of composing them into a form of a list.

[0067] In the present invention, the composition web document (which will also be referred to as a composition web page) to be a basis of the composition is described by the XML, a portion (partial document) of a range specified from the other specified web document is extracted and inserted into a specified position in the composition web document, and a conversion processing (a processing for conversion into a desired document structure) is applied to a specified range of the composition web document. Thus the present invention adopts a policy of providing two composition logic commands including insertion and conversion as elements in the composition web document.

[0068] Such a composition web document which is an XML document (XML page) will be referred to as an XML-P'z (XML-Pieces) document (XML-P'z page) here.

[0264] In this case, the input URL is the URL with XPointer indicating the web document W2 of the server A2, so that the XPointer processor 115 takes out the XPointer fragment, i.e., "#xpointer(//textbook)", and extracts the XML-DOM tree of the "textbook" element (and the partial documents containing its child and grandchild elements) pointed by this XPointer from the XML-DOM tree created at the step S213 (step S214). When a plurality of "textbook" elements exist, this processing is carried out for each one of them. This extracted XML-DOM tree is the XML-DOM tree of the partial document to be inserted.

[0286] As described above, the present invention defines the XML-P'z (XML-Pieces) document in which a composition web document to be a basis of the composition is described in the XML, portions (partial documents) of specified ranges are extracted from specified other web documents and inserted into specified positions in the composition web document, a conversion processing is applied to a specified range of the composition web document, and two

> composition logic commands for insertion and conversion are included as elements within the composition web document. The language processing system 100 extracts portions (partial documents) of specified ranges from web documents (pages) W2 and W3 of specified web servers (web servers A2 and A3) and insert them at specified positions in the XML-P'z document, and applies the conversion processing to a specified range described in the XML-P'z document. Eventually, by obtaining the XML document (the composed web document) W1 as a processing result of the XML-P'z language processing system 100, it is possible to carry out the composition of a plurality of web site information on a single web document easily and generically.

Hamada, paragraphs 0031, 0058, 0067, 0068, 0264, and 0286.

The above portions of *Hamada* teach extracting information (a partial document) from a web document and inserting the information into a new web document. Paragraph 0031, cited above, summarizes the teachings of *Hamada*. Partial documents are extracted from a set of first documents and inserted into a second document according to insertion positions of the partial documents on the second document. Paragraph 0058 emphasizes that "not necessarily the entire web document (HTML document, for example) but only a part of it will be required as the web site information, i.e., **contents**, so that the extraction function is required to extract a partial document from arbitrary web document" (Emphasis added). Paragraphs 0067-0068 simply state that the composed web document will be in XML format.

Paragraph 0264 discusses the extraction of an XML element, such as the "textbook" element, referenced by the XPointer fragment from a web document referenced by the XPointer. Finally, paragraph 0286 summarizes the teachings of *Hamada* by stating that "portions (partial documents) of specified ranges are extracted from specified other web documents and inserted into specified positions in the composition web document."

However, *Hamada* fails to teach the claimed feature of, "a component to add a reference to an existing navigation tree of a local portal, wherein the reference represents a placeholder for a navigation tree of a portal fragment of a remote portal and wherein the navigation tree defines a relationship between nodes of the navigation tree," as recited in claim 1. *Hamada* teaches the extraction of specified **content** (partial documents) from a specified web document /web page. For instance, *Hamada* states the following:

> [0060] Then, the commands to be provided include a partial document insertion command indicating which **portion of which web page** is to be extracted and where it is to be inserted.

Hamada, paragraph 0060 (Emphasis added).

Hamada teaches the extraction of a portion of a web page. In other words, *Hamada* teaches extracting specified **content** from a web page. In contrast, claim 1 recites "a placeholder **for a navigation tree** of a portal fragment of a remote portal and wherein the navigation tree **defines a relationship between** nodes of the navigation tree." The placeholder as recited in claim 1 is not for actual content but rather for the **relationship** between the nodes of the portal fragment. For example, if the relationship between the

nodes of the remote portal fragment changes, the claimed illustrative embodiments recognizes the change dynamically (*See*, Figure 5). In contrast, the change in the relationship between the nodes would not be recognized in view of only the teachings of *Hamada*. Consequently, because *Hamada* teaches a placeholder for actual content of a specified web page(s), as opposed to a placeholder for a navigation tree that defines a **relationship between** nodes of the navigation tree, *Hamada* does not teach the recited feature of claim 1. For similar reasons, *Hamada* fails to teach the remaining features of claim 1.

Furthermore, because claims 2-7 recite similar features as those claimed in claim 1, the same distinctions between *Hamada* and the claimed invention in claim 1 apply for these claims. Consequently, Applicants respectfully urge that the rejection of claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 has been overcome.

III. Conclusion

The subject application is patentable over the cited reference and should now be in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: August 31, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/James O. Skarsten/

James O. Skarsten
Reg. No. 28,346
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777
Attorney for Applicants

JS/ka/nh